



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/620,617	07/21/2000	Terry A. Smith	10991929-1	4729

22879 7590 07/15/2004

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PARK, CHAN S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/620,617

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

CHAN S PARK

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

1. The terminal disclaimer filed on 4/19/04 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of Application Number 09/620,957 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Specification

2. The corrected or substitute specification was received on 4/19/04. The specification is acceptable.

Response to Amendment

3. Applicant's amendment was received on 4/9/04, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1-25** are pending.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see Paper No. 5, filed 4/19/04, with respect to the Double Patenting rejection of claims 1-20 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The Double Patenting rejection of claims 1-20 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments, regarding claim rejections under 35 USC 102 & 103, filed on 4/9/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

5. In response to applicant's argument regarding the rejection of independent claims 1, 8 and 14, the applicant explains that references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "form" is an image that occurs more than once in a document on page 1 of the specification) are not recited in the rejected claims and thus the Office interprets the "form" as either an image or a text data. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant states that Gauthier fails to teach a method for processing images that occur more than once in a document. Again, this limitation is not recited in the rejected claims and thus the applicant is arguing something that is not disclosed in the claim. Additionally, referring to figs 5, 6 and 8 of Gauthier, Gauthier teaches that the form can be occurred more than once in a document (80e & 80l in fig. 6).

Applicant states that Gauthier fails to teach a step of responding to an indicator indicating permission is granted to print each instance of the form from the same video data. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Since Gauthier teaches a step of interpreting PDL specification having both static and dynamic data, the interpreter inherently knows that command is given to use the same video data. Again refer to 80e & 80l in fig. 6.

6. Therefore, the rejections of claims 1-20, as cited in the Office Action dated 4/9/04 are maintained and repeated in this Office action.

Claim Objections

7. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: perhaps "a second algorithm" should be "a second ***printing*** algorithm."
8. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: perhaps "a first plurality of commands" and "first document" should be used.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 2-4 recite second and third means which are not disclosed in the specification. The specification only discloses a control unit 350 which the Office interprets as the first means already recited in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 8-10 and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gauthier et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,243,172 (hereinafter Gauthier).

10. With respect to claim 1, Gauthier discloses a printer (high-speed printing system in fig. 1), comprising:

an I/O port capable of receiving a plurality of commands describing a document (job ticket 12 in conjunction with PDL files 14 and 15), the commands including both a named sequence describing a form (PDL files) and an indicator (commands sent from operator control system 20 of col. 5, lines 14-16);

first means for responding to the indicator indicating permission is granted to print each instance of the form (col. 5, lines 35-41) from the same video data (variable data), by processing and printing the named sequence according to a first printing algorithm (col. 6, lines 7-32).

The Office has interpreted accessing a copy 27' of the display list of the sub-template corresponding to the place holder and then merging the rendering commands

Art Unit: 2622

from the display list of the sub-template 27' with the merged display list 30 in col. 6, lines 17-22, as the applicant's claimed first printing algorithm.

Furthermore, Gauthier teaches that the PDL command files are PostScript specifications created by an applicant program (col. 5, lines 24-27). Therefore, it is inherent that the printer has an I/O port to receive the files.

11. With respect to claim 2, Gauthier discloses a printer, further comprising:

second means for responding to the indicator indicating each instance of the form is to be printed from new video data (variable data), by processing and printing the named sequence according to a second printing algorithm (col. 6, lines 7-32).

In a case when a place holder is not detected, the reference teaches that the printer takes other method or algorithm than the first printing algorithm discussed in rejection for claim 1. The office has read the other algorithm as a second algorithm.

12. With respect to claim 3, Gauthier discloses a printer, further comprising:

second means for responding to the indicator indicating that the form is a fixed form (static data), by processing and printing the named sequence according to a second printing algorithm (col. 7, lines 7-15).

13. With respect to claim 4, Gauthier discloses a printer, further comprising:

third means for responding to the indicator indicating that the form is a background image (display list), by applying a third printing algorithm to process and print the named sequence (col. 5, line 65 – col. 6, line 6).

14. With respect to claim 8, Gauthier teaches a method of processing and printing a named sequence describing a form, comprising:

Art Unit: 2622

receiving the named sequence (PDL files 14 and 15) and an associated parameter (job ticket 12 in col. 5, lines 7-15);

responding to the parameter being set to a first value, indicating permission is granted to print each instance of the form (col. 5, lines 34-41) from the same video data (variable data), by converting the named sequence into video data (graphic state) and then using the video data to print each instance of the form (col. 5, lines 45-51).

Note that Gauthier et al. calls raster image (converted video data) as graphic attributes (col. 1, lines 57). Furthermore, these bitmap will be printed on a hard copy or copies of documents (col. 1, lines 26-31).

The Office has interpreted accessing a copy 27' of the display list of the sub-template corresponding to the place holder and then merging the rendering commands from the display list of the sub-template 27' with the merged display list 30 in col. 6, lines 17-22, as the applicant's claimed first printing method disclosed in claim 8.

15. With respect to claim 9, Gauthier teaches a method of processing and printing a named sequence describing a form, further comprising:

responding to the parameter being set to a second value, indicating that each instance of the form is to be printed from new video data (variable data), by generating new video data to print each instance of the form (col. 6, lines 7-32).

In a case when a place holder is not detected, the reference teaches that the printer takes other method or algorithm than the first printing method discussed in rejection for claim 8. The office has read the other method as a second printing method disclosed in claim 9.

Art Unit: 2622

16. With respect to claim 10, Gauthier teaches a method of processing and printing a named sequence describing a form, further comprising:

responding to the parameter being set to a second value, indicating each instance of the form is to be printed from new video data (variable data), by converting the named sequence into display list data (graphic state) and then using the display list data to print each instance of the form (col. 6, lines 7-32).

Note that Gauthier calls raster image (converted video data) as graphic attributes (col. 1, lines 57). Furthermore, these bitmap will be printed on a hard copy or copies of documents (col. 1, lines 26-31).

In a case when a place holder is not detected, the reference teaches that the printer takes other method or algorithm than the first printing method discussed in rejection for claim 8. The office has read the other method as a second printing method disclosed in claim 9.

17. With respect to claim 21, Gauthier discloses the printer of claim 1, further comprising:

second means for responding to the indicator indicating each instance of the form is to be printed from new video data (variable data) or for responding to the indicator indicating that the form is a fixed form (static data), by processing and printing the named sequence according to a second printing algorithm (col. 7, lines 7-15).

18. With respect to claim 22, Gauthier discloses a printer, comprising:

an input/output port for receiving PDL print commands (job ticket 12 in conjunction with PDL files 14 and 15);

Art Unit: 2622

a control unit (the control task 22) operatively connected to the input/output port;
a print engine (print engine 36) operatively connected to the control unit; and
the control unit configured to respond to PDL print commands that include a named sequence describing a form and an indicator (commands sent from operator control system 20 of col. 5, lines 14-16) by (1) if the indicator indicates permission is granted to print each instance of the form (col. 5, lines 35-41) from the same video data (variable data), processing the named sequence according to a first printing algorithm (col. 6, lines 7-32), (2) if the indicator indicates each instance of the form is to be printed from new video data (variable data), processing the named sequence according to a second printing algorithm (col. 6, lines 7-32), (3) if the indicator indicates the form is a fixed form (static data), processing the named sequence according to the second algorithm (col. 7, lines 7-15), or (4) if the indicator indicates the form is a background (display list) image, processing the named sequence according to a third algorithm (col. 5, line 65 – col. 6, line 6).

The Office has interpreted accessing a copy 27' of the display list of the sub-template corresponding to the place holder and then merging the rendering commands from the display list of the sub-template 27' with the merged display list 30 in col. 6, lines 17-22, as the applicant's claimed first printing algorithm.

Furthermore, Gauthier teaches that the PDL command files are PostScript specifications created by an applicant program (col. 5, lines 24-27). Therefore, it is inherent that the printer has an I/O port to receive the files.

In a case when a place holder is not detected, the reference teaches that the printer takes other method or algorithm than the first printing algorithm. The office has read the other algorithm as a second algorithm.

19. With respect to claim 23, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 22, are applicable.

20. With respect to claim 24, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 22, are applicable. The PDL files have specific commands as to which files will be reused (static and dynamic in col. 5, line 42 – col. 6, line 6).

21. With respect to claim 25, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 22, are applicable.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vidyanand U.S. Patent No. 6,330,071.

22. With respect to claim 1, Vidyanand discloses a printer (printer 603), comprising:
an I/O port capable of receiving a plurality of commands describing a document (print job 602), the commands including both a named sequence describing a form and an indicator (fig. 6);

first means for responding to the indicator indicating permission is granted to print each instance of the form from the same video data (master data 803), by processing and printing the named sequence according to a first printing algorithm (col. 4, lines 48-56).

Additionally, referring to fig. 10, each variable page has indicator indicating corresponding master page. Thus, Examiner interprets the indicator as an authorization code for permitting the access to the master page.

23. With respect to claim 2, Vidyanand discloses a printer, further comprising:
second means for responding to the indicator indicating each instance of the form is to be printed from new video data (variable data 802), by processing and printing the named sequence according to a second printing algorithm (col. 4, lines 53-55).

24. With respect to claim 3, Vidyanand discloses a printer, further comprising:
second means for responding to the indicator indicating that the form is a fixed form (watermark, background, or business form), by processing and printing the named sequence according to a second printing algorithm (col. 4, lines 7-13).

Note that the term "fixed" can be interpreted in many different ways. Since watermark, background, and business form are "fixed" in the image as to other variable data, the Office believes that Vidyanand teaches this particular limitation. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

25. With respect to claim 4, Vidyanand discloses a printer, further comprising:
third means for responding to the indicator indicating that the form is a background image, by applying a third printing algorithm to process and print the named sequence (col. 4, lines 7-9 & col. 5, lines 5-7).

Art Unit: 2622

26. With respect to claim 5, Vidyanand discloses the printer of claim 1, wherein the plurality of commands are received from a computer externally connected to the I/O port (fig. 6).

27. With respect to claim 6, Vidyanand discloses the printer of claim 5, wherein the indicator is generated by the computer (col. 4, lines 41-42).

28. With respect to claim 7, Vidyanand discloses the printer of claim 4, wherein the plurality of commands are received from a source externally connected to the printer (col. 4, lines 41-42 & fig. 6).

29. With respect to claim 8, Vidyanand discloses a method of processing and printing a named sequence describing a form, comprising:

receiving the named sequence and an associated parameter (col. 4, lines 41-47);

responding to the parameter being set to a first value, indicating permission is granted to print each instance of the form from the same video data (master data 803), by converting the named sequence into video data and then using the video data to print each instance of the form (col. 4, lines 48-56).

Additionally, referring to fig. 10, each variable page has indicator indicating corresponding master page. Thus, Examiner interprets the indicator as an authorization code for permitting the access to the master page.

30. With respect to claim 9, Vidyanand discloses the method of claim 8, further comprising:

responding to the parameter being set to a second value, indicating that each instance of the form is to be printed from new video data (variable data 802), by generating new video data to print each instance of the form (col. 4, lines 53-55).

31. With respect to claim 10, Vidyanand discloses the method of claim 8, further comprising: responding to the parameter being set to a second value, indicating each instance of the form is to be printed from new video data (master data 803), by converting the named sequence into display list data and then using the display list data to print each instance of the form (col. 4, lines 48-56).

32. With respect to claim 11, Vidyanand discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the plurality of commands are received from a source externally connected to the printer (col. 4, lines 41-42 & fig. 6).

33. With respect to claim 12, Vidyanand discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the plurality of commands are received from a source externally connected to the printer (col. 4, lines 41-42 & fig. 6).

34. With respect to claim 13, Vidyanand discloses the method of claim 12, wherein step disclosed in claim 9 comprises the following step:

flagging the display list data as a candidate for caching (page buffer 804 in fig. 8).

It is apparent that the ripped master data is stored to be cached and combined with variable data when there is variable data associated with the master data (col. 4, lines 48-56).

35. With respect to claim 14, Vidyanand discloses a computer comprising:

means for generating a plurality of commands describing a document, the commands including a named sequence describing a form and at least one command including indicating permission is granted to convert the named sequence once into video data and to then print each instance of the form from the same video data (master data 803 in col. 5, lines 48-56);

means for transmitting the plurality of commands to a printer (col. 4, lines 41-42 & fig. 6).

Additionally, referring to fig. 10, each variable page has indicator indicating corresponding master page. Thus, Examiner interprets the indicator as an authorization code for permitting the access to the master page.

36. With respect to claim 15, Vidyanand discloses the computer of claim 14, further comprising:

means for generating a second plurality of commands describing a second document, the commands including a second named sequence describing a form and at least one command indicating new video data (variable data 802) is to be generated to print each instance of the form (col. 4, lines 41-41 & 53-55).

37. With respect to claim 16, Vidyanand discloses the computer of claim 15, further comprising:

means for generating a third plurality of commands describing a third document, the commands including both a third named sequence describing a form and at least one command indicating the form is fixed form (watermark, background, or business form in col. 4, lines 7-9).

Art Unit: 2622

38. With respect to claim 17, Vidyanand discloses the computer of claim 16, further comprising:

means for generating a fourth plurality of commands describing a fourth document, the commands including a fourth named sequence describing a form and at least one command indicating the form represents a background image (col. 4, lines 7-9 & col. 5, lines 5-7).

39. With respect to claim 18, Vidyanand discloses the computer of claim 14, wherein the printer is responsive to the plurality of commands by printing the document (col. 4, lines 41-42 & fig. 6).

40. With respect to claim 19, Vidyanand discloses the computer of claim 14, wherein the printer is connected to the computer over a network (col. 4, lines 41-42 & fig. 6).

41. With respect to claim 20, Vidyanand discloses the computer of claim 14, wherein the plurality of commands form a print job (col. 6, lines 49-57).

42. With respect to claim 21, Vidyanand discloses the printer of claim 1, further comprising:

second means for responding to the indicator indicating each instance of the form is to be printed from new video data (variable data 802 & col. 4, lines 53-55) or for responding to the indicator indicating that the form is a fixed form (watermark, background, or business form), by processing and printing the named sequence according to a second printing algorithm (col. 4, lines 7-13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-7 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier.

43. With respect to claims 5 and 6, Gauthier discloses all the limitations disclosed in claim 1, but Gauthier does not explicitly disclose if the plurality of commands and the indicator are received from a computer externally connected to the I/O port.

However, Gauthier teaches that the PDL files can be PostScript create by an application program such as a wordprocessor, illustrator, or CAD system which further implies that a computer can create the PDL files (col. 5, lines 24-27). Furthermore, Examiner takes Official Notice that receiving plurality of commands and other print data from a computer externally connected to the I/O port is well known in printer technology.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to Gauthier those presented for claim 5, are applicable.

44. With respect to claim 11, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5, are applicable.

45. With respect to claim 12, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5, are applicable.

Art Unit: 2622

46. With respect to claim 13, the reference discloses step of flagging the display list data as a candidate for caching (col. 5, lines 46-48).

47. With respect to claim 14, as noted in claim 1, Gauthier discloses a printer (high-speed printing system in fig. 1), comprising:

an I/O port capable of receiving a plurality of commands describing a document (job ticket 12 in conjunction with PDL files 14 and 15), the commands including both a named sequence describing a form (PDL files) and at least one command indicating permission is granted (commands sent from operator control system 20 of col. 5, lines 14-16) to convert the named sequence once into video data and then print each instance of the form from the video data.

Note that Gauthier calls raster image (converted video data) as graphic attributes (col. 1, lines 57). Furthermore, these bitmap will be printed on a hard copy or copies of documents (col. 1, lines 26-31).

The reference, however, does not explicitly disclose where the data is generated. Although a computer is not disclosed for generating a print data, the reference teaches that the PDL files can be PostScript create by an application program such as a wordprocessor, illustrator, or CAD system (col. 5, lines 24-27).

Examiner takes Official Notice that creating and transmitting plurality of commands and other print data from a computer externally connected to the I/O port or network is well known in printer technology.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to the Gauthier printer to receive the commands generated by a computer externally connected to the I/O ports.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to implement the Gauthier printer in the network system for a broad printing communication.

48. With respect to claim 15, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 8 and 14, are applicable.

49. With respect to claim 16, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 9 and 14, are applicable.

50. With respect to claim 17, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 10 and 14, are applicable.

51. With respect to claim 18, the Gauthier et al. reference discloses that the printer is responsive to the plurality of commands by printing the document (col. 10, lines 10-42).

52. With respect to claim 19, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 14, are applicable.

53. With respect to claim 20, Gauthier discloses that the plurality of commands form a print job (col. 10, lines 10-42).

Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vidyanand in view of Gauthier.

54. With respect to claim 22, Vidyanand discloses a printer comprising:
an input/output port for receiving print commands (print job 602 in fig. 6);

a control unit operatively connected to the input/output port;
a print engine operatively connected to the control unit; and
the control unit configured to respond to print commands that include a named sequence describing a form and an indicator by (1) if the indicator indicates permission is granted to print each instance of the form from the same video data (master data 803), processing the named sequence according to a first printing algorithm (col. 4, lines 48-56), (2) if the indicator indicates each instance of the form is to be printed from new video data (variable data 802), processing the named sequence according to a second printing algorithm (col. 4, lines 53-55), (3) if the indicator indicates the form is a fixed form (watermark, background, or business form), processing the named sequence according to the second algorithm (col. 4, lines 7-13), or (4) if the indicator indicates the form is a background image, processing the named sequence according to a third algorithm (col. 4, lines 7-9 & col. 5, lines 5-7).

Note that the term “fixed” can be interpreted in many different ways. Since watermark, background, and business form are “fixed” in the image as to other variable data, the Office believes that Vidyanand teaches this particular limitation. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Additionally, referring to fig. 10, each variable page has indicator indicating corresponding master page. Thus, Examiner interprets the indicator as an authorization code for permitting the access to the master page.

Art Unit: 2622

Vidyanand, however, does not disclose expressly that the print commands are PDL print commands.

Gauthier discloses a printing system that interprets PDL print commands.

Vidyanand and Gauthier are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is the printing art.

Since PDL print commands are widely used in the printing art, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate PDL print commands of Gauthier into the printer of Vidyanand.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to generate the master/variable data by using PDL commands for the printer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Vidyanand and Gauthier to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

55. With respect to claim 23, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 22, are applicable.

56. With respect to claim 24, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 22, are applicable. Additionally, refer to paragraphs 21-24 of current Office action for the four different processing scenarios.

57. With respect to claim 25, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 22, are applicable.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAN S PARK whose telephone number is (703) 305-2448. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (703) 305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

csp
July 9, 2004

Chan S. Park
Examiner
Art Unit 2622


EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER